



United States
Department
of Interior

Bureau of
Land Management

May 2003

Finding of No Significant Impact

Weaver Mountain Fuels Treatment Project AZ-020-2002-0094

Phoenix Field Office, Arizona BLM
Yavapai County, Arizona



West view from Wild Horse Mesa, Photo by W. Boyett

For Information Contact: Teri Raml
21605 N. 7th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ
Telephone: (623) 580-5500

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for the stewardship of our public lands. It is to manage, protect, and improve these lands in a manner to serve the needs of the American people for all times. Management is based on the principles of multiple use and sustained yield for our nation's resources within a framework of environmental responsibility and scientific technology. These resources include: recreation; rangelands; minerals; timber; watersheds; fish and wildlife; wilderness; air; and scenic, and cultural values.

Finding of No Significant Impacts

The setting of this project is localized and impacts will occur in the immediate treatment area only. This action is a continuation of fuels projects that have occurred for many years on the Phoenix Field Office, Phoenix Arizona. After considering the environmental effects described in the Weaver Mountain Fuels Treatment Environmental Assessment AZ-030-2002-32 and reviewing the Project Planning Record, I have determined that these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment considering the context and intensity of impacts (40 CFR 1508.27). Therefore, an environmental impact statement (EIS) will not be required.

Formatted

Teri Raml, Field Office Manager

Date

I base my findings on the following:

Factors Considered	Intensity (How Much of an Impact)	Reasons the Action is Not Significant
1. Beneficial & Adverse Effects	<i>Both beneficial and adverse effects have been considered, (see EA pages 10-18).</i>	<i>Non-significant. The potential adverse effects would be limited to acceptable levels by implementing the listed mitigation measures. Therefore, beneficial effects are expected out weight the potential adverse effects from implementing the proposed project.</i>
2. Public Health & Safety	<i>Firefighter and public safety will be improved on approximately 14,000 acres of intermingled lands due to the reduced risk of destructive wildland fire (see EA pages 4-18).</i>	<i>Non-significant. The proposed action would not significantly affect public health and safety but would reduce current and expected risks. The actions selected were designed to increase firefighter and public safety and decrease the costs of fire suppression efforts, the damage that would occur to facilities and structures, water quality and to 14,000 acres of natural resources. There would be an increase to area safety by reducing the hazardous fuel loads thereby allowing direct suppression methods by fire fighters. The implementation of this project would reduce the risk of a wildland fire reaching catastrophic levels and crossing boundaries onto the adjacent National Forest and private lands.</i>
3. Unique Characteristics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic or cultural 	<i>No Parklands, Prime farmlands, Wetlands, Wild & Scenic Rivers, or Ecologically critical areas are within the treatment areas, therefore none</i>	<i>The project area is not in the proximity of the listed unique characteristics except cultural resources. The proposed action</i>

Factors Considered	Intensity (How Much of an Impact)	Reasons the Action is Not Significant
resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parklands, Prime farmlands, Wetlands • Wild & Scenic Rivers • Ecologically critical areas 	<i>will be affected. Cultural resource surveys have been completed and there were none identified within the treatment areas. Mitigation and Monitoring measures will prevent impacts and provide protection if new sites are discovered during or after project implementation.</i>	<i>would not adversely affect any historic or cultural resource. The proposed action is non significant because no unique characteristics would be impacted. (See EA pages 11 and 14, and Cultural Clearance, in the Project Planning Record).</i>
4. Effects likely to be highly controversial?	<i>There is no substantial controversy over the effects of this proposal. See EA pages 5-16.</i>	<i>Non-significant. Since there is no controversy related to the effects disclosed in the EA, there is no significant effect. See Consultation and Coordination, page 1 of the EA.</i>
5. Effects highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks?	<i>The Kingman/Phoenix Zone has completed five environmental documents covering fuels reduction projects for interior chaparral vegetation types over the past ten years. These projects have exhibited the desired change in vegetation structure, by reducing vegetation accumulation thereby reducing catastrophic wildfire risk. The past projects have benefited wildlife, and domestic livestock by creating a mixed age class structure with improved forage production. See EA pages 4-18.</i>	<i>Non-significant because in our professional experience with these types of project(s)/action(s), effects are not uncertain, and we are not taking a unique or unknown risk by implementing the proposed action.</i>
6. Precedent established for future actions?	<i>These actions do not set any precedent for future actions.</i>	<i>Non-significant. The EA is a site-specific document that did not identify future actions or set precedence for future projects. Therefore any proposed future project will be evaluated on its own.</i>
7. Cumulatively significant?	<i>Effects are expected to be similar to effects from similar projects implemented in the past (see above). This coupled with the mitigation and monitoring, the small overall percentage of the Field Office is being treated with the result of no significant cumulative impacts.</i>	<i>Non-significant. Based on the effects disclosed in the EA and supporting documentation in the project planning record, there are no cumulative impacts. See EA pages 4-18.</i>
8. Loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural or historical resources (NHPA consistency)	<i>No sites will be impacted, (See page 14 of the EA).</i>	<i>Non-significant because it has been analyzed and documented that no sites exist therefore, no sites will be impacted.</i>

Factors Considered	Intensity (How Much of an Impact)	Reasons the Action is Not Significant
9. Adversely affect T&E species or habitat? (ESA consistency)	<i>No Federal listed species or habitat present. (See EA pages 4-18, the Wildlife Specialist report and Wildlife Clearance in the Project Planning Record.)</i>	<i>Non-significant because T&E species and their potential habitat has been analyzed and documented that no T&E species occur in the project area therefore, none will be impacted.</i>
10. Consistent with Federal, State or local laws for the protection of the environment?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal Land Policy and Management Act, 1976. The National Environmental Policy Act, 1969. The Clean Water Act, 1990. The Endangered Species Act, 1973. 	<p><i>Yes – The proposed action would be consistent with the PFO Resource Management Plan and with applicable state and federal laws. (See pages 2, and 16 -17 of the EA.)</i></p>	<p><i>Non-significant, the action is consistent with applicable local, state and federal laws.</i></p>

Formatted

Formatted